

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/546,005	Applicant(s) STARKE ET AL.	
	Examiner David K. O'Dell	Art Unit 1625	

All Participants:

(1) David K. O'Dell.

(2) Gregory T. Lowen.

Date of Interview: 18 April 2008

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 9:30 A. M.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
N/A

Claims discussed:
N/A

Prior art documents discussed:
N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The examiner called Mr. Lowen to discuss the response to the last office action. In response to the restriction requirement all claims to what the examiner believed was the elected invention were canceled. There was an apparent error in some of the variable definitions made by the examiner. The Figure 1 of the restriction requirement was consistent with the examiners intention, however this was not made clear in the variable recitations in the group definitions. The examiner suggested a new restriction requirement/species election be made that was substantively the same, which accompanies this summary.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/David K. O'Dell/
Examiner, Art Unit 1625

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

